

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-8, 17, 18 and 21-23 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1 and 21 have been amended, Claims 21-23 have been previously added, and Claims 9-16, 19 and 20 have previously been withdrawn from consideration. No new matter has been added to the claims. Applicants believe that the amendments and remarks provided herein put the application in condition for allowance, or at least in better form for appeal.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Without acceding to the rejection, Claim 21 now recites, *inter alia*, a non-grinding, double screw kneader with two screws arranged in parallel next to each other and each screw having the same rotational direction such that the non-grinding, double screw kneader does not alter the length of the reinforcing fibers. Support is provided, for example, in paragraph [0008] of Applicants' disclosure and prior filed Claim 23. Therefore, Applicants believe that the rejection is moot and respectfully request that it be withdrawn.

Claims 1-8, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 1088645 (hereinafter EP '645) in view of Japanese Patent 51-66367 (hereinafter JP '367) further taken with U.S. Patent No. 4,353,763 to Simons ("Simons"). Without acceding to the rejection, Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, the kneading means being a non-grinding, screw kneading aggregate. Support is provided, for example, in paragraph [0008] of Applicants' disclosure and prior filed Claim 23.

As admitted in the prior Office Action, the device disclosed EP '645 is an extruder and that kneading elements are not taught or suggested (see, 4/26/2010 Office Action, page 4, paragraph 6). As noted in Applicants' prior response no English

translation was provided and no English language Abstract is available for JP ‘367, so Applicants’ comments are based on what they best understand from the Figures in JP ‘367. Therefore in addition to that stated in the previous rejection, which is incorporated herein by reference thereto, JP ‘367 is now also understood to not teach or suggest a non-grinding, screw kneading aggregate, as recited in Claim 1.

At best JP ‘367 may be said to teach or suggest a kneading device, but it does not teach or suggest the non-grinding, screw kneading aggregate, as recited in Claim 1, since there is nothing in the Figures in JP ‘367 that teaches or suggests that the kneading device therein is a non-grinding, screw kneading aggregate. In fact, if anything, the Figures of JP ‘367 would not provide the teaching or suggestion or motivation to one of skill in the art to assume that the kneading device therein is a non-grinding, screw kneading aggregate. Specifically, Figure 1A appears to show the rolling of the output kneaded plastic strip 7 with a separately supplied continuous, fiber strip 4 onto a mandrel 1. As a result, since the fibers are not shown being feed into the kneading device, it is not possible to determine whether the kneading device in JP ‘367 is a non-grinding one. In fact, given the design and apparent use that is disclosed in JP ‘367, it would not be reasonable for one of skill in the art to assume a non-grinding, screw kneading aggregate is in JP ‘367. Instead, it is more likely to assume that the screw kneading device in JP ‘367 is actually a grinding or blending device, since its main purpose appears to be to ensure that the plastic and aggregate mixture feed into the kneading device is homogeneously combined and mixed together.

Simons is also not understood to teach or suggest all of the above discussed features, nor does the Office Action rely on Simons for such teachings. Therefore,

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 distinguishes patentably from EP ‘645, JP ‘367 and Simons.

The dependent claims are also believed to be patentable due at least to their dependence from Claim 1, as well as for the additional subject matter recited in the dependent claims.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as set forth in paragraph 5 of the Office Action further taken with U.S. Patent No. 6,419,864 to Scheuring et al. (“Scheuring”). Without acceding to the rejection, Claim 21 recites, *inter alia*, a non-grinding, double screw kneader with two screws arranged in parallel next to each other and each screw having the same rotational direction such that the non-grinding, double screw kneader does not alter the length of the reinforcing fibers. It is apparent that the applied references do not teach or suggest these features.

In addition to Scheuring failing to make up for the deficiencies of EP ‘645, JP ‘367 and Simons in regards to the rejection of Claim 1, Scheuring also fails to teach or suggest a non-grinding, double screw kneader with two screws arranged in parallel next to each other and each screw having the same rotational direction such that the non-grinding, double screw kneader does not alter the length of the reinforcing fibers, as recited in Claim 21. Specifically, Scheuring is described as an extruder that cuts fiber rovings that are fed into the extruder (see, Abstract; Column 2, lines 6-8 and Column 4, lines 36-39) and is provided with kneading disks 28, 33 that operate upstream from the point at which the fiber rovings 12 are introduced into the fiber feed zone 34 where they are apparently cut to the desired length by screw elements 35 and then mixed by a pair of mixing elements 37 and 38 (see, FIGs. 2 and 3; and Column 4, lines 16-44). As a result,

the fibers introduced into the fiber feed zone 34 are never engaged by the kneaders 28 and 33.

Therefore, it is apparent that the combination of EP '645, JP '367, Simons and Scheuring does not teach or suggest a non-grinding, double screw kneader with two screws arranged in parallel next to each other and each screw having the same rotational direction such that the non-grinding, double screw kneader does not alter the length of the reinforcing fibers, as recited in Claim 21.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 21 distinguishes patentably from EP '645, JP '367, Simons and Scheuring.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as set forth in paragraph 5 of the Office Action further taken with U.S. Patent No. 4,466,854 to Hawerkamp ("Hawerkamp"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hawerkamp is not understood to teach or suggest all of the above discussed features in relation to Claim 1, nor does the Office Action rely on Hawerkamp for such teachings. Therefore, it is apparent that the combination of EP '645, JP '367, Simons and Scheuring does not teach or suggest a non-grinding, screw kneading aggregate, as recited in Claim 22.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least those reasons given above for Claim 1, Claim 22 distinguishes patentably from EP '645, JP '367, Simons and Hawerkamp.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as set forth in paragraph 6 of the Office Action further taken with Hawerkamp.

Hawerkamp is not understood to teach or suggest all of the above discussed features in relation to Claims 1 and 21, nor does the Office Action rely on Hawerkamp for

such teachings. Therefore, it is apparent that the combination of EP '645, JP '367, Simons, Scheuring and Hawerkamp does not teach or suggest a non-grinding, double screw kneader, as recited in Claim 23.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least those reasons given above for Claims 1 and 21, Claim 23 distinguishes patentably from EP '645, JP '367, Simons, Scheuring and Hawerkamp.

Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that any further action is necessary to place this application in better form for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (T4494-16116US01) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 10, 2011

By: /David R. Schaffer/
David R. Schaffer
Reg. No. 43,089

Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.
1751 Pinnacle Drive
Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833
(703) 903-9000